

REMARKS

Claims 8-10 and 13-34 remain pending, although claims 17-27 and 31-33 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 8, 28, and 34 are currently amended. No claims are canceled or added via the present amendment.

Claims 8-10, 13-16, 28-30, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Klatt* (DE 298 21 644/U.S. Patent No. 6,592,031) in view of *Matsusaki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,218). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be withdrawn.

For an embodiment of the invention, applicants disclose an identification-information-acquisition unit exemplified by a fingerprint-reading unit, which includes a fingerprint sensor. The fingerprint sensor faces an opening that is usually closed by a shutter. (See applicants' specification, paragraph bridging pages 35-36.)

The rejected claims are now amended to recite the shutter of the invention. More specifically: Claims 8 and 28 describe an extension device. The extension device described by claim 8 has an identification-information-acquisition unit, which receives identification information through a sensor and has a "shutter operable to cover a sensing surface of the sensor." The extension device described by claim 28 has a fingerprint-reading unit, which detects a fingerprint through a sensor and has a "shutter operable to cover a sensing surface of the sensor." Claim 34 describes a computer system having an identification-information-acquisition unit, which receives identification information through a sensor and has a "shutter operable to cover a sensing surface of the sensor." The remaining rejected claims depend from one of claims 8, 28, and 34, so they also describe the quoted subject matter.

Klatt does not teach or suggest providing a shutter operable to cover the sensor. On the contrary, *Klatt* explicitly teaches cutout 15 for exposing the sensor 5 while providing no suggestion of the desirability to cover the sensor. *Matsuzaki et al.* is directed to an imaging apparatus having box shape. Although Fig. 8 of *Matsuzaki et al.* shows a cover 24, this cover is positioned adjacent the *side* of camera unit 11 and provides no protection for lens 11a. Thus, *Matsuzaki et al.* does not suggest, even remotely, a shutter operable to cover a sensing surface of a sensor.

Accordingly, the asserted prior art, each alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Thus, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is now solicited.

In view of the remarks above, applicants now submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is hereby requested. If for any reason it is believed that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is welcome to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to discuss resolution of the remaining issues.

If this paper is not timely filed, applicants petition for an extension of time. The fee for the extension, and any other fees that may be due, may be debited from Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Joseph L. Felber".

Joseph L. Felber
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,109
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

Enclosure: Petition for extension of time

JLF/au

Q:\2000\000993\000993 Response to 2-04-05 Action.doc